DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 150 746 EA 010 387

AUTHOR Arends, Richard; And Others
TITLE Inservice Education and the 6 O'Clock News. OSSC Bulletin Vol. 21, No. 7.
INSTITUTION Oregon School Study Council, Eugene.
PUB DATE Mar 78
NOTE 33p.
AVAILABLE FROM Oregon School Study Council, 124 College of Education, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon 97403 ($2.00; $1.50 if prepaid; 10% discount for 10 or more copies)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Change Agents; *Change Strategies; Credentials; *Delivery Systems; Educational Innovation; Educational Problems; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Models; Needs Assessment; Organizational Development; State Departments of Education; Teacher Centers; Teacher Education Curriculum; *Teacher Improvement
IDENTIFIERS Linking Agents

ABSTRACT

Several assumptions currently held by many inservice planners and deliverers are presented and challenged. A new model of inservice programs is outlined that pays attention to the characteristics of maturing and growing professional educators and that demands new forms for delivering inservice to individuals and school clients. Inservice delivery models proposed include the linking agent model and the organization development model. The linking agent model consists of field agents who travel from school to school helping clients identify their needs and then providing assistance as they search for research validated solutions. The organization development model aims training and development efforts toward helping people in schools come together and use the resources they already possess in more effective and satisfying ways. The paper concludes with a list of policy and organizational changes needed within agencies that currently house the major actors in inservice education: local school districts, state departments of education, and institutions of higher education. (Author/MLF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED150746

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

OSSC BULLETIN

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

OSSC

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

INSERVICE EDUCATION AND THE 6 O'CLOCK NEWS

by
Richard Arends
Richard Hersh
Jack Turner

Oregon School Study Council
Vol. 21, No. 7
March 1978

EA 010 387

PREFACE

This Bulletin describes four assumptions currently held by many inservice planners and deliverers: (1) educators during inservice are just like educators in preservice; (2) it is possible to design inservice programs that are responsive to teachers needs; (3) it is possible to package inservice in traditional course arrangements; and (4) it is possible and desirable to provide inservice to individual educators apart from the context of the school or unit in which they work.

Each of these assumptions is challenged by the authors and a new model of inservice is outlined--a model that pays more attention to the characteristics of maturing and growing professional educators and one that demands new forms for delivering inservice to individuals and school clients.

The authors of this Bulletin are Richard Arends, Assistant Professor, Division of Teacher Education, University of Oregon; Richard Hersh, Associate Dean, Division of Teacher Education, University of Oregon; and Jack Turner, Coordinator of Inservice Education, Teacher Corps Project, University of Oregon. They conclude this paper with a list of policy and organizational changes needed within agencies that currently house the major actors in inservice education: local school districts, state departments of education and institutions of higher education. Positive cooperative effects can accrue if there is a breakthrough in current ideas about inservice education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section		Page
I.	Introduction	1
II.	A Challenge to Present Assumptions	2
	Assumption #1: Educators in Inservice are Just Like Educators in Preservice	2
	Assumption #2: It is Possible to Design Inservice Programs that are Responsive to Teachers' Needs	4
	Needs Assessment and the Instrument	6
	Needs Assessment and Choice	7
	Needs Assessment and Lag	7
	Needs Assessment and Fad	8
	Assumption #3: It is Possible to Package Inservice in Traditional Course Arrangements	8
	Assumption #4: It is Possible and Desirable to Provide Inservice to Individual Educators Apart From the Context of the School in Which They Work	9
	The Act of Teaching	10
	Nature of Schools	12
III.	Toward More Effective Inservice Practices	13
	Attention to the Characteristics of the Mature Professionals	14
	New Delivery Models	16
	The Linking Agent Model	16
	The Organization Development Model	18
	Human Interaction Between Helpers and Clients	19
IV.	New Images and Organizational Arrangements for Coordinating Inservice Programs	21
	Local Education Associations	21
	State Departments of Education	22
	Institutions of Higher Education	24
	By Way of Summary	25
V.	References	27

I. Introduction

The demand or need to improve inservice education for school personnel has existed many years. Currently, the demand or need is increasing at an accelerating rate for three reasons. First, with declining enrollments and related reductions in the work force, schools must emphasize developing current human resources over hiring new ones. Second, as the demands for education reform (e.g., instruction in basic skills, career education, integration of more pluralistic student groups into the mainstream) have grown louder, more schools have attempted to implement new programs that require new attitudes and skills on the part of current staff. Third, traditional practices for organizing inservice education and times of scarce resources have rendered many would-be providers of inservice impotent.

In this paper we discuss several issues that deserve consideration in efforts to improve inservice. First, we present and challenge several assumptions currently held by many inservice planners and deliverers. Second, we present our view of effective inservice practices. Finally, we describe what must be done to construct an appropriate inservice system. Throughout, we emphasize that breaking through conceptual and implementation problems requires understanding current relationships among an array of variables that impact on inservice and recognizing the potential synergistic effect that can result from new relationships among those variables.

II. A Challenge to Present Assumptions

Any effort to innovate is shaped by people's conceptual maps and by the organizational forms they create for themselves. Conceptual maps and organizational forms have a tremendous impact on what participants perceive to be "right" and on what they do. Inservice education is a case in point. Whether we attempt innovative inservice from a position in a district, an institution of higher education, or from some other agency, most of us act as if certain assumptions were true. Four assumptions that deserve to be challenged are discussed below.

Assumption #1: Educators in Inservice are Just Like Educators in Preservice.

Inservice education, as traditionally conceived, is a perfect example of the consequences of transferring a paradigm without sufficient regard for the nature of the new client population to which the paradigm is being assigned. From a historical perspective, many of the designs and delivery mechanisms for inservice have emanated from the same place and the same perspective that has always trained preservice teachers--colleges of education. It is therefore not surprising that essential attributes of preservice and inservice education have a great deal in common. The case is made apparent when essential attributes of preservice and inservice training are compared point by point.

ATTRIBUTES	PRESERVICE TRAINING	INSERVICE TRAINING
1. Client needs assessed by others.	Yes	Usually
2. Client needs attributed by others.	Yes	Usually
3. Skills acquisition the primary focus.	Yes	Yes
4. Classroom-like training setting.	Yes	Usually
5. Linear and discrete presentation of subject at hand.	Yes	Yes
6. Length of training period dictates scope and depth.	Yes	Yes
7. Training possible only when a minimum number of clients sign up.	Yes	Yes
8. Training designed by the trainer.	Yes	Usually
9. Clients go to trainer, not vice versa.	Yes	Yes
10. Client treated as individual, not as member of a unit.	Yes	Usually

Figure 1: Characteristics of Preservice and Inservice Training

This paired outline should make clear our assertion that the paradigm for training new teachers has been transferred almost intact to the area of providing inservice experiences for veterans.

We believe the assumption that what is good for the apprentice is good for the "journeyperson" is debilitating since it limits the value of inservice to little more than professional ritual.

We believe that the client populations to be helped by inservice and preservice education are very different. Mature professionals are

different than students preparing for careers in education or neophyte teachers trying to master basic skills and to survive socialization into the profession. If we have learned from our own experiences of working with educators over the past several years and if we read adult development theorists accurately, we think mature professionals are asking for something more than traditional professional training. These persons, many of whom are past the halfway point in their careers and many of whom already possess advanced degrees and lifetime certificates, are seeking a much broader array of educational and self-awakening opportunities.

Assumption #2: It is Possible to Design Inservice Programs that are Responsive to Teachers' Needs.

There is a substantial body of empirical findings (Lawrence, 1974; Berman and McLaughlin, 1975; Fullan and Pomfret, 1976; Emrick, 1977) that suggests we should take the requirements, needs and preferences of users or clients as the starting point of all inservice activities. We agree that the logical place to begin an inservice effort is to be responsive to client needs. However, the rub comes when procedures for assessing needs are inadequate and raise a host of moral questions.

Taken as a group, teachers and administrators, as do all persons, have many needs, and to define their needs requires, in part, a decision about what is "good." That decision rests on criteria implicit in questions such as, "What must I do to receive an increase in my salary?," "How may I improve my teaching of reading?," "How may I increase my job satisfaction?" Because humans live in socially complex environments,

they confront a multitude of "goods" from which to choose or that are forced upon them.

It is difficult enough for one individual to make choices among "goods." Members of a group, such as the faculty of a particular school, will find that they hold competing notions of what is "good," and that to translate their values into inservice needs requires a group decision.

But, as a chagrined speaker at a recent conference lamented, "We had over ninety teachers indicate a real need for primary reading instruction on our needs assessments. We designed an inservice class specifically to meet this need and only three of the bastards showed up." We quote literally here to indicate the presence of the morality problem; also perhaps to reveal that this speaker was not perfectly in touch with how classroom teachers look upon inservice training as presently constituted. Obviously the speaker was approaching the point of condemning teachers who sent him on a wild goose chase that involved spending significant time and resources. "If not outright deceit, such teacher behavior is at least irresponsible," he fumed, vowing never to be suckered thusly again. "They deserve all the problems they have," said the moralist as he rested his case.

There is a segment in court martials called "Extenuation and Mitigation" where certain facts are introduced to add context and reality to the problem being considered. We wish to introduce classroom "extenuating and mitigating" particulars which, in our view, knock the whole concept of inservice, as presently conceptualized, into such a cocked hat that is not viable. We think implications for a

reconceptualized inservice model may be derived from some of the following classroom teacher realities.

Needs Assessment and the Instrument.

> "The actual teaching day concluded, I flopped into my chair in the faculty room for a respite before confronting tomorrow's plans. While my wits were idling, I was handed a needs assessment to fill out and return. It didn't surprise me that this needs assessment specified all of the choices or topics available and asked me to rank order them. This format secretly pleased me, because I didn't have to invent all the possibilities; I only had to prioritize someone else's. I dutifully performed the ritual, handed in the paper, and returned my thoughts to tomorrow's planning."

Several things of importance happened in the typical needs assessment ritual outlined above. One obvious problem was that the teacher was asked to self-diagnose and didn't know how to. We refer the reader here to Bill Drummond's "Open Letter on Inservice Education" (1975):

> "I believe that the ways available to us for communicating individual needs in teacher education have to be improved. I know my own case, given a reasonably secure and supportive psychological climate, it is still hard for me to tell someone about what my real needs are. This may be because I don't know what my real needs are, or perhaps because I don't get timely and appropriate feedback on my work, or because I don't attend to the feedback I do get. Perhaps, more accurately, I'm not used to talking about my needs, and I'm very hesitant to share much of myself with someone else who might or might not help me. My needs, therefore, tend not to be communicated unless there is some external reason or some personal crisis. My guess is that my reluctance to communicate needs is a condition widely shared in the teaching profession" (pp. 5-6).

We think Drummond's observation here is valid for humans at large and not just for teachers. The point is that, for some reason, when each of us is approached with a blank sheet or asked for self-diagnosis of training needs, we will be hesitant to communicate openly to others.

Needs Assessment and Choice. A further problem, perhaps too obvious to dwell on, is that every teacher in any needs assessment sampling is a veteran of at least sixteen years of institutionalization; that is, of having his or her training needs assessed and prescribed by others. The predictable solution to this problem has been for needs assessors to provide a roster of possible choices and to ask teachers for a ranking based on their needs. The consequences of this solution are many and risky: Teachers' responses are suggested or cued by others; the choice that each teacher has ranked as number one will be accorded absolute weight rather than the intended relative importance; each teacher may tend to respond as representative of teachers as a group rather than as the individual self, rationalizing that teachers at large apparently need instruction on reading techniques even though "I" don't, and knowing that the courses offered in response to this survey will be determined by which choice gets the most votes.

Needs Assessment and Lag. Another problem: the link between a needs survey and a consequent inservice response is usually invisible and so stretched out in time that when (or if) the inservice response is eventually provided, teachers either have met their needs some other way, or have developed new and more important needs in the meantime. Like a diagnostician asking for a snapshot picture of the client months before prescribing treatment, the typical mechanisms do not allow for timely response and trust building--skipping a dynamic period of refining the initial diagnosis and substituting a "don't call us, we'll call you" void.

Needs Assessment and Fad. Probably the worst problem is that, in response to the typical needs assessment, teachers tend to make absolutely predictable choices which are derived, not from their own experience in classrooms, but from whatever is currently receiving the most column inches of space in newspapers. Sex education, for example, is not a "hot" inservice topic today--not because teachers don't feel the need for more competence, but because the topic has been pushed off the front pages of newspapers by the "Why Can't Johnny Read" debate. We think that the speaker at the Inservice Conference quoted earlier could have predicted that the majority of teachers responding to his needs assessment in 1975 would have ranked reading instruction number one as a perceived need. The pregnant issue, however, is when and whether they ever really felt the need.

Assumption #3: It is Possible to Package Inservice in Traditional Course Arrangements.

The standard course, whether taught in a university classroom or at the school site (as now is so in vogue), is only one of many arrangements in which people can learn. But most inservice is restricted to this format; we have a delivery model that is very much like the "6 O'Clock Evening News."

A child illuminated this problem when he asked how it could be that there are always exactly thirty minutes of news each day. The child's view of reality indicated that a newscaster should have only a few minutes worth of news on some evenings and perhaps two hours of substance for the audience on other days. Yet every newscast lasts

for exactly thirty minutes, indicating that something other than substance determines length.

When inservice training comes in prescribed "boxes," with the instructor determining both its calendar length and its substance breadth, many teachers will find that the bulk of the content either does not apply to their situation or duplicates what they already know. We think a majority of classroom teachers' problems can be dealt with or solved by consultation that requires far less investment than tuition for eight weeks. And when teachers recognize that they need help, they don't want to be told that help is on the way, but that they will have to wait until the beginning of the next term to get it (and then only if twelve or more similarly beleaguered teachers sign up).

Most inservice offerings are as predictable in length as the evening news; the traditional "eight weeks, one evening per week, three hours per night, for three hours credit" arrangement for inservice determines the substance of the training and the first job of inservice trainers is to fill the "box" even if they must resort to using excelsior. We are so accustomed to having the size and substance of inservice "boxes" predetermined for us that we seldom question this practice. Our assertion is neither radical or impudent; it is simply one of the dependable consequences of group instruction where a specialist designs mass instruction for people about whose background he or she is essentially ignorant.

Assumption #4: It is Possible and Desirable to Provide Inservice to Individual Educators Apart from the Context of the School in Which They Work.

Perhaps the toughest inservice problem to contend with is how to provide experiences that lead individuals toward personal and professional growth while recognizing that important inservice needs exist in work units or groups in schools. A corollary to this problem lies in assuming that we can improve education by upgrading the individual components of educational organizations.

We contend that schools are complex social systems and that important and lasting educational improvement requires changes in the norms and structures of schools more than changes in the skills of individual educators. We call for broader understanding of the act of teaching, the nature of schools as organizations, and how organizational forms implicate change efforts.

The Act of Teaching. Consider the teacher's task. Whether spending all day in an elementary classroom with the same group of students or teaching five or six different groups of students in a secondary classroom, the teacher has little time for adult interaction. According to Bruce Joyce (1976), teachers are second only to air-traffic controllers in the amount of daily stimuli they receive (one stimulus every eight seconds). We are not only talking about the estimated 70,000 teachers who will be physically assaulted in their classrooms this year (Portland Oregonian of February 26, 1978). We also refer to the lesser assaults, injustices, and emotional frustrations that come from the day-in-day-out drains of teaching. The moments between classes, a hurried lunch period (often spent supervising students) and, perhaps, one "free" hour per day are not times for "letting down"

and taking a refreshing break or for sustained professional dialogue with its potential for energizing one with new ideas, excitement and planning, and for reinforcing for known successes. Sarason (1971) points out that teachers' contact with children is not only different than contact with their peers, but also has a consequence of producing "loneliness." As a result, teachers are psychologically alone and adapt to being alone even though they operate in densely populated and hurried settings. How can we reconcile the fact that teachers have to work interdependently in order to carry out the mission of schools with the fact that organizational structures within schools dictate aloneness and independence?

An anecdote which symbolizes this reality is embedded in the frustrated parent's comment, "I want to demonstrate interest in my child's schooling, but when I ask her what happened in school today, she always replies, 'Oh, not much.'" An insightful listener to this common soliloquy suggested that if the tables were turned and the girl became questioner regarding what had happened in her mother's life today, the mother's response would likely be much the same. The only real alternative is for the two to sit down together for an extended dialogue which would create a context for recounting noteworthy events.

This tale may explain the lonely teacher phenomenon and may suggest what will reduce the loneliness: (1) tired teachers act out the parts of mother and daughter in the faculty lounge after school every day; (2) there is no possibility for a substantive response unless both parties have sufficient time to develop and nurture it; (3) the end of

a work day is probably the worst possible time to interact with others except superficially; and (4) the amount of time for context building that is necessary for full comprehension on the part of the listener is inversely proportionate to the tightness of organizational linkages between two people; (i.e., if the mother works in the school, a full reply from the student would consume only one hour instead of three).

Nature of Schools. Goodlad and Klein's book, Behind the Classroom Door (1970), points to the inhibiting effects on teaching practices of schools as organizations. Despite decades' worth of highly visible and well-funded organizational innovations such as team teaching, open classrooms, modular scheduling, discovery learning, and individualized instruction, Goodlad and Klein conclude that the traditional graded school, with its commitments to grades, lower order objectives, and convergent activities, continues to dominate the American scene.

> "Our data lead to the firm conclusion that the overwhelming majority of our 150 classrooms--in organization, subject matter, materials and mode of instruction--were geared to group norms and expectancies rather than to individual differences in learning rate and need" (p. 83).

Why have the extensive reform movements barely touched American classrooms? Goodlad and Klein suggest two reasons. First, the organizational and social arrangements in schools have inhibited change by isolating teachers. Schools have not developed alternative arrangements; instead, they have opted for the prevailing system of education either from fear of public rebuke or from perceiving no need to change significantly what has "worked" before. Second, Goodlad and Klein blame the training that teachers receive.

> "It would appear that neither preservice nor inservice teacher education programs have provided them with precise pedagogical understandings and skills required for diagnosing and remedying the learning programs and needs of individual pupils" (p. 94).

We add only that preservice or inservice programs have failed to provide teachers with skills to work collaboratively with one another and with other professionals.

Bruce Joyce (1976) provides a cogent analysis of the institutional nature of the problem for teacher change:

> "The life of the classroom teacher is a threat to his or her mental health when events are proceeding smoothly! To innovate in such a place is to court disaster. To innovate in inservice education will be no less hazardous than to change curriculum. The life of the teacher is so awful that anything additional overloads him/her almost immediately unless his/her conditions of life are changed substantially" (p. 13).

> "I attribute the nature of teaching to the nature of its institutional life. We have to ask what can be done to those institutions to free people to become the creative decision makers which education would seem to require in its best senses" (p. 7).

The structure of the school as institution, says Joyce, is highly resistant to the forces for change, especially forces emanating from outside the school. Time, for example, is just one very important variable in the multitude of variables required for personal growth. But from where in the school day is the time to come? Teachers may have good intentions, but have professional lives that are to prohibit meaningful incorporation of new information.

III. Toward More Effective Inservice Practices

If we reject assumptions that guide current inservice programs, what can we conceptualize to guide future efforts? This section is

our initial answer to that question. In it we describe features of inservice that will, we think, promote lifelong learning for individual professionals and change in educational organizations more surely than present assumptions do.

Attention to Characteristics of Mature Professionals

Adult development theorists such as Checkering, Levinson, Sheehey, Lasher, and Hunt, have produced ideas that can inform inservice efforts. From their works, it is possible to infer that mature professionals have different needs and will approach learning differently than their younger, less experienced colleagues. We have synthesized four important characteristics below.

First, mature professionals will need something more than new understandings and skills for their repertoire. Instead they will seek opportunities to integrate in new ways the knowledge and skills they possess. They will look for inservice programs that allow them to clarify career options, to prepare for new careers, to increase their interpersonal competencies and to actualize their potential not only as professionals but as human beings.

Second, adult learners will seek ways to integrate three, normally fragmented, aspects of life--work, education, and leisure--into their inservice experiences. We think this particularly true for professionals who consider and design restructured jobs, sabbaticals, and the like to seek that kind of integration.

Third, the mature professional will need collegiality rather than criticism from their inservice leaders. Criticism of public and private

institutions has long been a function of universities and in some ways, their criticism has served a valuable social purpose. However, with a growing sophistication on the part of people in schools, criticism gets in the way of providing and receiving valued help and assistance.

Finally, the mature professional is the one who has the most responsibility for integrating theory and practice. David Hunt (1977) provides a very useful set of concepts to explain the necessity for inservice agents and adult learners to "flex" and to be reflexive and responsive to each other during the inservice process. In Hunt's terms, traditional inservice may be viewed as a linear theory-to-practice scenario. The theorist or inservice agent describes and prescribes to the practitioner who in turn delivers the services to students. Hunt claims that this view of the theorist-practitioner relationship provides the rationale for "teacher-proof" programs so often recommended by inservice agents.

This view of teacher as a passive recipient who is eventually slated to "paint by the numbers" ignores the teacher's attitudes and wealth of experience-based knowledge. Hunt urges us to rid ourselves of that theory-practice paradigm and replace it with a theory-practice-person conception and to view the development of educators as one of persons-in-relation. This new paradigm forces us into an adequate conception of the teacher as person and provides a set of questions that need to be considered in any effort: (1) who is the person?; (2) what does the person want?; (3) what does the person believe?; (4) what does the person know?; (5) what does the person know how to do?; and (6) what is the person doing now?

Hence inservice agents (also persons) should take into account not only clients' knowledge but also their intentions, competence, beliefs, and actions. The agent should acknowledge that these features are, along with the agents' own intentions, competence, etc., embedded in any inservice venture. The effectiveness of inservice thus depends on the inservice agents' and the clients' abilities to adapt (or "flex," to use Hunt's term) to each other. Such a process as applied to the general notion of inservice is critical if we are to transform the mechanical and irrelevant inservice of the past into a more responsive and relevant inservice for mature professionals in the future.

New Delivery Models

We see no way to improve inservice education unless present delivery models--inservice classes and workshops for credit--are supplemented by models that more directly improve schools and promote lifelong learning and models with inservice educators who assume roles as field agents, facilitators, and educational brokers. Two models are described below. The first is borrowed from agriculture and employs inservice agents who link individual and school clients to resources and practices developed and validated by others. The second, borrowed from business and industry, uses inservice agents who help individual and school clients discover and make use of their own resources. Both models have been experimented with in education.

The Linking Agent Model. During the past five years, several small experiments have been conducted to test the efficacy of using

linking agents for the purpose of moving educational research into exemplary practice in the public schools. The model employed in these experiments consist of field agents who travel from school to school helping clients identify their needs and then providing assistance as they search for research validated solutions. Unlike most current inservice delivery models, this one takes the service to the clients rather than summoning clients into classes; agents make themselves available for individual and informal contact at the site of the clients' problem rather than dictating to assembled students what topics may be considered. From the client's perspective, the field agent is as close as the telephone and the problem does not have to wait until some future time when a class is offered.

We are impressed with the initial successes reported in evaluations of this model (see Seiber and Louis, 1972 and Emrick, 1977) and excited about the possibilities it provides for inservice. However, we want to raise a note of caution against relying on this model as the only delivery mechanism. Three problems are worthy of note. First, even though inservice gains in terms of responsiveness, there is an accompanying loss of efficiency which results in higher costs.

Second, even though it is popular to think about moving proven practice from one educational setting to another, the truth of the matter is that the knowledge base for prescribing solutions to educational problems is still very small and probably will not increase rapidly in the next several years.

Third, and perhaps the toughest problem to contend with, is that we can be lulled into stressing the similarities between agriculture and education without acknowledging some very important differences.

Since most farmers can decide, on their own, to adopt or reject a new practice, it makes sense to work with them directly and as individuals. In contrast, the decision to adopt a new practice or implement a new program in a school is normally not a decision that an individual educator makes. Since schools are complex social systems, serious attempts at important and lasting improvements require changes in the norms and structures within the schools organization. It is this issue that our second model addresses more fully.

The Organization Development Model. In many school improvement efforts, the common strategy is to accept the present organizational arrangements as they now exist and begin specifying inservice training that presumably will change the individual educator. A body of research evidence has been accumulated over the past decade (Miles, 1965; Sarason, 1971; Smith and Keith, 1971; Berman and McLaughlin, 1975; Fullan and Pomfret, 1977; Emrick, 1977; and Schmuck, Runkel, Arends and Arends, 1977) and it all points toward a very clear message--school improvement cannot be accomplished without attention to the fabric of the school's culture and organization. As a result of these findings, it is clear that schools need to be developed as organizations. A growing body of theory and practice has been developed to accomplish this goal and we believe it should be incorporated into future inservice practices.

The organization development perspective says that instead of trying to improve isolated components of schools, training and development efforts must aim toward helping people in schools come together and use the resources they already possess in more effective and satisfying ways.

The technology that has grown up around this tradition (see Goodlad, 1975; Jung, 1977; Pino and Emory, 1977; Lohman, 1977; Schmuck, Runkel, Arends, and Arends, 1977; Arends and Arends, 1977) assumes that educators need to practice and have time for thinking about how they communicate with one another, solve problems, make decisions, develop curriculum together, or whatever. It presumes that members of schools, just as members of athletic teams and symphonic orchestras, need to practice ways to combine their skills into synergistic team efforts. Furthermore, this model recognizes that school improvement efforts do not necessarily occur quickly or in a linear fashion. Initial progress is likely to be accompanied with backsliding. The model demands long-term relationships between agents and client systems and requires agents who are knowledgeable about the psychology, sociology, and politics of client systems and the theory and practice of planned change in complex organizations.

Human Interaction between Helpers and Clients

A third feature of inservice we have chosen to discuss is one that emphasizes that inservice is a process of human interaction between clients and helpers and that all educational problems cannot be solved with inservice. This feature takes into account Mann's (1976) point that many efforts at changing or improving schools translate quickly into issues of values and power and reinforces our earlier point about issues of morality:

> "People at the delivery level, those who were to be the targets of the change agent efforts, were generally unwilling to agree that their goals for students were morally or ethically inferior to anyone else's or that their pedagogy was worse than someone else's. Thus,

> models of change rooted in cooperation and/or influence fell short in situations where there were legitimate differences among the parties. Where two parties persist in their disagreement, yet one is somehow to do what he or she would not do otherwise, we have a situation of power" (p. 314).

Given a power struggle, those who are to be changed usually resist and projects' goals and strategies must be modified. This modification of project features and the resultant changes in the school as a function of the project is referred to by Mann as "mutual adaptation." Without allowing for such mutual change, Mann suggests that projects are doomed to failure.

Furthermore, we believe that, regardless of the elegance of inservice purposes and delivery models, the success of many efforts will rest on the human relationships between clients and their helpers. We will need to retrain or train a new generation of inservice agents who can understand the complexity of the client-consultant relationship and who recognize the complexity of all their intervention efforts. In the future the successful efforts will be those that (1) rely on a variety of inputs; (2) that allow for many different attitudes; (3) that provide for long chains of events; and (4) the willingness of agents to flex with unplanned problems. Future agents will recognize the growing independence of client systems and acknowledge that no single linear or undimensional model will suffice.

What we are proposing is the need to design inservice opportunities which provide the opportunity for synergy--the overall effect becoming greater than any of the interactive constituent parts. Thus those planning

for inservice must consider the identified issues and plan for them, not in linear fashion but all at the same time. No one of the constituent elements of the model is useful while isolated. The additive model of change will not work. Planning for change while seeing the whole plan is crucial.

IV. New Images and Organizational Arrangements for Coordinating Inservice Programs

The most striking observation we have of inservice programs at the present time is their diversity and lack of coordination. School districts, state departments of education, institutions of higher education, regional educational agencies all participate in inservice in some way but often take a win-lose stance toward each other. Each remains more concerned about financial support, student credit hours and political power than in a coordinated reponse to the needs of educators and schools. It is our contention that before new conceptualizations can be realized and new delivery modes can emerge, we must create totally different organizational mechanisms for funding and delivering inservice programs. These new mechanisms and procedures will require each of the present educational organizations to change many of its present ways of relating to inservice and will require movement into new arenas and relationships with each other. The future we envision is described below.

Local Education Associations (LEA's)

Each local school district or agency will need to build internal units of some kind to coordinate inservice activities and to link with other

outside agencies. Some larger districts already have an internal unit in place; most do not. The locally governed Teacher Center movement is a step in the right direction and should provide for more local direction in inservice. Many resources and services can be made available through the type of centers described by Delaney (1977), but these, in our mind, will be insufficient unless they are tied to district-wide efforts and linked to other agencies and inservice units at least on a regional basis.

Another function for the LEA inservice units will be to responsively solve problems unique to the district. Thus, in a single state, one district might emphasize "retooling" teachers to work in middle schools while another district emphasizes strengthened roles for parent councils. Realizing district-wide and locally identified problems seems a possible function for district inservice units and one that no other agency can fulfill.

State Departments of Education (SDE's)

State Departments of Education will need to take an expanded role in some aspects of inservice education and pull back in others. Because of the SDEs' regulatory functions, we think it unlikely that they can provide responsive inservice programs of the type we have described. We do, however, think they can assume leadership roles in providing the funding for locally based inservice efforts and in finding new and imaginative ways to combine inservice activities, lifelong learning activities, and credentialing.

Many potentially useful inservice efforts are stymied at present because of inadequate financial support. Bruce Joyce (1976) reports that even though millions are currently spent on inservice, most of this goes to piecemeal, uncoordinated and ineffective efforts. We contend that SDE's must assume leadership for acquiring the financial resources for inservice education--resources that are necessary not only to finance the services themselves but, more importantly, to provide released time for teachers so they participate in inservice during the school day.

The states through the SDE's and licensing agencies can also provide leadership in the area of credentialing. Even though many might wish it to be different, it is probably accurate to say that education will remain "credential conscious" in the years ahead. Credits will be used by licensing agencies to control membership into the teaching and administrative ranks of public schools. Credits will also be used by teachers and administrators to gain professional advancement and monetary rewards.

The present credentialing process in most states involves both some state agency that specifies requirements and colleges of education that establish a credit-hour system and deliver courses for credit. Current trends suggest that states want ever more standardized guarantees in terms of subject matter covered and demand procedures so credits earned from one place are comparable to those earned in another. Practitioning educators, however, want programs that meet their needs and that enhance their own school improvement efforts. Colleges of education have been caught "between a rock and a hard place" and have tended to grant

credit only for work completed in classroom settings and experiences that generate student credit hours.

We believe that the states can reverse this trend (some already are) and establish requirements for renewing credentials so as to reward inservice activities that directly relate to the lifelong learning goals of individual educators and to agreed upon school improvement efforts.

Institutions of Higher Education

To become a viable force in inservice education, colleges of education within institutions of higher education need to set higher priorities for inservice education, create new units to coordinate inservice activities and find new means to grant credit for experienced based learning.

Setting higher priorities for inservice education within colleges of education will require rearranging the traditional research, teaching, and service trinity, so that service becomes equal to the other two functions. It will require a change in the ways people in colleges of education view themselves and their work and the views that others have of them.

Just as we have proposed that every district needs to establish a unit to coordinate inservice activities, we contend that colleges of education, likewise, need to create special units for inservice education and staff development. These newly formed units should be integrated within the colleges of education, the larger university and colleagues in the state and region. Among the number of functions such a unit might perform include: initiating inservice and staff development offerings on and off campus; assisting local, state and national policy

groups in achieving reform goals; initiating leadership training for other inservice educators; coordinating region-wide networks of inservice and staff development agencies, and studying the process of school improvement through inservice training and staff development. We also envision such a unit engaging in what Heffernan, Macy and Vickers (1976) have labeled "educational brokering," that is, making available career and inservice guidance services for the purpose of helping educators identify their learning needs and assisting them as they seek out experiences within a state or region that could help meet their needs.

Finally, colleges of education need to find means to appraise professional competence gained through life experience and grant academic credit for it. We believe that portfolio and testing procedures similar to those developed by the Cooperative Assessment of Experimental Learning Project (Keeton, 1976) could be used.

By Way of Summary

The future we envision and that we have described will require individuals in each of our educational institutions to change the images they have of themselves and the images they currently hold for others. For example, educators--teachers, administrators and helping professionals of all kinds--in local educational agencies will need to see that it is possible for them to take charge of their own destinies, become more resourceful in solving their own problems, and be more willing to shop around for quality help when outside assistance is needed. Personnel in state departments of education will need to view as one of their top priorities the job of educating their publics to the importance of inservice

education and to build a system of financing that supports lifelong learning for educators. Finally, faculty in colleges of education will need to admit to themselves and get others to see that one of their primary functions is not only to produce new knowledge but to engage in the creative synthesis, transformation, and transmission of knowledge into practice for preservice trainees and for the mature professionals in inservice programs.

V. References

1. Arends, Richard I. and Arends, Jane H. Systems Change Strategies in Educational Settings. New York: Human Sciences Press, 1977.

2. Argyris, Chris and Schon, Donald A. Theory in Practice: Increasing Professional Effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1974.

3. Berman, Paul and McLaughlin, M. W. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change. Vol. IV: The Findings in Review. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation, 1975.

4. Devaney, Kathleen. "The Informal Work Place: An Approach to Teachers' Centers." in Teacher Centers, Commissioner's Report on the Education Professions 1975-76. HEW Publication No. (OE) 77-12012, 1977.

5. Drummond, William H. "An Open Letter to the Dean RE Inservice Education." Mimeo, 1975.

6. Emrick, J. A. and Peterson, S. M., and Agarwala-Rogers, R. Evaluation of the National Diffusion Network (two volumes). Menlo Park, CA: Stanford Research Institute, 1977.

7. Emrick, John A. and Peterson, Susan M. "A Synthesis of Findings Across Five Recent Studies of Educational Dissemination and Change." Mimeo, 1977.

8. Fullan, Michael. "Overview of the Innovative Process and the User." Interchange, Volume 3, 1972, pp. 1-46.

9. Fullan, Michael and Pomfret, Alan. "Research on Curriculum and Instruction Implementation." Review of Educational Research. Winter, 1977, pp. 335-397

10. Goodlad, John I. The Dynamics of Change in Schools. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

11. Goodlad, John I. and Klein, M. F. Behind the Classroom Door. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones, 1970.

12. Heffernan, J. M., Macy, F. V., and Vickers, D. F. Educational Brokering: A New Service for Adult Learners. Syracuse, N. Y.: National Center for Educational Brokering, 1976.

13. Hunt, David E. "Teacher Centers as Persons-in-Relations." Paper presented to Conference on Teacher Centers at the University of Chicago, 1977.

14. Hunt, David E. Theorists are Persons Too: On Preaching What You Practice.

15. Joyce, Bruce R., Howey, Kenneth R. and Yarger, Sam J. Inservice Teacher Education. Vols. 1-5, Palo Alto, CA: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, 1976.

16. Jung, Charles. Organization Development in Schools. Portland, Oregon: Commercial Educational Distributors, 1977.

17. Kurland, N. D. "A National Strategy for Lifelong Learning." Phi Delta Kappan, February, 1978. pp. 379-385.

18. Lawrence, Gordon. Patterns of Effective Inservice Education, Tallahassee, Florida: Department of Education, 1974.

19. Lohman, J. and Wilson, G. Social Conflict and Negotiative Problem Solving. Portland, Oregon: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1977.

20. Mann, Dale. "Making Change Happen." Teachers College Record, Volume 77, No. 3, February 1976. pp. 314.

21. Michaels, Marguerite. "Our Nation's Teachers Are Taking A Beating." Parade: The Sunday Oregonian, February, 1978. pp. 6-7.

22. Miles, Matthew. Innovation in Education. New York: Teachers College Press, 1964.

23. Moore, Donald C., et. al. Assistance Strategies of Six Groups that Facilitate Educational Change at the School/Community Level. Chicago: Center for New Schools, 1977.

24. Pino, R. F. and Emory, R. E. Preparing Educational Training Consultants, I, II, and III. Portland, Oregon: Commerical Educational Distributors, 1977.

25. Sarason, Seymour B. "Community Psychology, Networks, and Mr. Everyman." American Psychologist. 31, 1976, pp. 317-328.

26. Sarason, Seymour B. The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

27. Schein, Edgar H. Professional Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.

28. Schmuck, Richard A., Runkel, Philip J., Arends, Jane H. and Arends, Richard I. Second Handbook of Organization Development in Schools. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield Press, 1977.

29. Sieber, S. D., Louis, K. S., and Metzher, L. The Use of Educational Knowledge: Evaluation of the Pilot State Dissemination Programs. (two volumes). New York: Columbia University, Bureau of Applied Social Research, 1972.

30. Smith, Louis M. and Keith, Pat M. Anatomy of Educational Innovation. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1971.

31. Turner, Jack. "Inservice: Needs Assessments, Academic Freedom and the 6 O'Clock News." Memo, Eugene, Oregon: 1977.